UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,402	09/28/2006	Alon Cohen	1582/8	6585

44696   7590   10/22/2009

DR. MARK M. FRIEDMAN
C/O BILL POLKINGHORN - DISCOVERY DISPATCH
9003 FLORIN WAY
UPPER MARLBORO, MD 20772

EXAMINER
WILLIS, JONATHAN U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2441	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/22/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mark_f@friedpat.com
friedpat@yahoo.com
sharon_l@friedpat.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/599,402	COHEN, ALON
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JONATHAN WILLIS	2441	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 July 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>21-41</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>21-41</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 September 2006</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

         1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is responsive to the Amendments filed on 07/23/2009. Claims

1-20 have been cancelled. Claims 21-41 have been added. Claims 21-41 are presented

for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 27, 34, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention.

        It is unclear what exactly a logic request and a UI request consists of in order to

differentiate between the two different requests.

4.   Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

        The claim recites that a data request is required to be routed through a pseudo

server in **step (b)**, but then the data request is denied if it is not routed though a pseudo

server in **step (d)**. It is unclear how requests are denied for not being routed in a

subsequent step from when they were previously required to be routed through a

pseudo server.

Examiner suggests either removing **step (d)** or changing the data request

requirement in **step (b)**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
States.

6.   Claims 21-22, 26-29, 33-36 and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

being anticipated by US 2001/0042171 A1 to Vermeulen.

7.   In regard claim 21, **Vermeulen** teaches a server-side data-processing machine

(*see "Remote Server,"* **in Fig. 1 [14]**) for securely and efficiently fulfilling network

requests, the server-side data-processing machine comprising:

(a)   a data-access engine, residing in a server memory (*see inherent file*

storage component inside Remote Server, e.g. "Servers 14…Such servers

dedicated to storing files," **in [0025] Lines 7-8**) of server-side data-processing

machine (*see "Remote Server," ***in* **Fig. 1 [14]**), for communicating (*see*

"communication between Proxy and Remote Server, **in Fig. 2 [12] [14] [22] [24]**)

with at least one pseudo server (*see control program in Proxy Server, e.g. "proxy*

server 12…executes a control program stored in main memory 34…to perform

the functions described in…FIG. 2," **in [0026] Lines 1-11**) residing in a

secondary memory *(see "RAM of Proxy server,* **in Fig. 3 [34]**) of a secondary

data-processing machine (*see "Proxy Server,"* **in Fig. 1 [12]**),

> wherein said at least one pseudo server (*e.g. "a control program,"* **in**

[0026] Lines 1-11) includes a server-logic module (*e.g. "a control*

program…containing a sequence of control instructions to perform the functions

described in…FIG. 2," **in [0026] Lines 1-11**) and a user interface (UI) (*see*

interface of proxy to receive client output initiated by client user, e.g. "an interface

to the client," **in Fig. 3 [35]**) for fulfilling data requests (*see "File Request" and*

"File Transfer," **in Fig. 2 [21]**) originating from a client memory (*see "requests*

inherently originated from the clients RAM," **in Fig. 4 [43]**) of a client-side data-

processing machine (*see "Client,"* **in Fig. 2 [11]**), and

> wherein a data request from said client-side data-processing machine for

data stored in said data-access engine must be routed through one of said at

least one pseudo server (*see "Client" "Proxy" and "Remote Server,"* **in Fig. 1 [11]**

[12] [14], *e.g. "If client 11 wants to load a file from server 14, this request is*

handled via proxy server 12," **in [0022] Lines 9-11**).

8.   In regard to claim 22, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing

machine (*see "Remote Server,"* **in Fig. 1 [14]**) of claim 21, wherein said data-access

engine is located in a first network (*see inherent Control Program of Remote Server in a*

Remote Network, **in Fig. 1 [13][14]**) and at least one of said at least one pseudo one

server (*see Control Program of Proxy Server, e.g. "a control program stored in main*

memory 34," **in [0026] Lines 1-11**) is located in a second network (*see Network*

between client and Proxy, **in Fig. 1 [11] [12]**, *e.g. "A client 11 is connected to a proxy*

server 12," **in [0022] Lines 2-3**) having said client-side data-processing machine (*see*

"Client," **in Fig. 2 [11]**).

9.   In regard to claim 26, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing

machine (*see "Remote Server,"* **in Fig. 1 [14]**) of claim 21, wherein a local data request

from said client-side data-processing machine (*see "Client,"* **in Fig. 2 [11]**) for data

stored in one of said at least one pseudo server can be fulfilled directly by said one of

said at least one pseudo server (*e.g. "If client 11 requests a file that has already been*

loaded and therefore is still contained in the cache, the proxy server will send this file

directly from the cache to the client," **in [0022] Lines 13-15**).

10.   In regard to claim 27, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing

machine (*see "Remote Server,"* **in Fig. 1 [14]**) of claim 21, wherein a logic request or a

UI request from said client-side data-processing machine (*see users operating client to*

request data, e.g. "control program may be an Internet browser...inputs by a user of the

client," **in [0028] Lines 2-3**) can be fulfilled by said at least one pseudo server (*e.g. "If*

client 11 requests a file that has already been loaded and therefore is still contained in

the cache, the proxy server will send this file directly from the cache to the client," **in**

[0022] Lines 13-15).

11.   Claims 28-29 and 33-34 are corresponding system claims of apparatus claims

21-22 and 26-27 respectively; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

12.   Claims 35-36 and 40-41 are corresponding method claims of apparatus claims

21-22 and 26-27 respectively; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14.   Claims 23-24, 30-31, 37-38 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Vermeulen in view of US 6,604,143 B1 to Nagar et al.

(hereinafter referred to as Nagar).

15.   In regard to claim 23, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing

machine (*see "Remote Server," * **in Fig. 1 [14]**) of claim 22, wherein said data-access

engine is configured to communicate (*e.g. "control program adapted to…return the*

*computed hash code to the client via an interface of server 14," * **in [0025] Lines 4-7**)

with other client-side data-processing machines (*e.g. "several clients are connected to*

*such a proxy server via an internal corporate network (intranet)," * **in [0023] Lines 4-5**),

but

    Vermeulen does not teach that the data-access engine communicates with other

client-side data-processing machines via pseudo servers residing within said first

network as claimed.

    However, **Nagar** teaches the data-access engine (*see "Server Program," * **in Fig.**

2 [220]) communicates with other client-side data-processing machines (*see multiple*

computers and intranet as the client-side, **in Fig. 2 [202] [206] [208]**) via pseudo

servers residing within said first network (*see multiple proxy servers inside intranet*, **in**

Fig. 2 [202] [228] [230]).

    Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the claimed invention to add the features of using a plurality of proxy servers to

communicate with clients inside of an intranet network, as disclosed in **Nagar**, into the

teachings of **Vermeulen**, since both of the references are directed toward proxy caches,

hence would be considered to be analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.

One would be motivated to do so because it is well known that in distributed

computer network systems (*e.g.* " *Computer network 13 with its servers 14 represents a*

distributed file system," **from Vermeulen in [0022]**), multiple system components may

be used in a larger system to facilitate larger amount's of requested information in order

to reduce the load on a single system component,

16.   In regard to claim 24, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing

machine (*see "Remote Server,"* **in Fig. 1 [14]**) of claim 21, but

         Vermeulen does not teach wherein said data-access engine is configured to

communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between said data access engine

and said at least one pseudo server as claimed.

         However, **Nagar** teaches a data-access engine (*see "Server Program,"* **in Fig. 2**

[220]) is configured to communicate via a content-filtering device deployed between

(*see "Response Filter,"* **in Fig. 2 [232] and Fig. 3 [320]**) said data access engine (*see*

"Server Program," **in Fig. 2 [220]**) and said at least one pseudo server (*see "Proxy*

Server," **in Fig. 2 [228]**).

         Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the claimed invention to add the features filtering content between a proxy

server and a remote server, as disclosed in **Nagar**, into the teachings of **Vermeulen**,

since both of the references are directed toward proxy caches, hence would be

considered to be analogous based on their related fields of endeavor.

One would be motivated to do so because **Nagar** discloses the current problem with state of the art filtering methods (*e.g. "Generally, once the software developer writes a system that performs any filtering of information, what is filtered or how it is filtered cannot be modified except by having the software developer create a whole new filtering system,"* **from Nagar in Col. 1, Lines 41-44**) and discloses the need for improvement in content filtering (*e.g. "Therefore it is desirable to improve the filtering of information."* **from Nagar in Col. 2, Lines 4-5**), and the incorporation of **Nagar** into **Vermeulen** could enhance **Vermeulen** by allowing for current modification of filter rules in filtering incoming and outgoing proxy request data as it is well known that proxies are filtered (*e.g. "The proxy server with plug-in filters allows for easy modification of what information to filter and how to filter it,"* **from Nagar in Col. 2, Lines 11-13**).

17.   Claims 30-31 are corresponding system claims of apparatus claims 23-24; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

18.   Claims 37-38 are corresponding method claims of apparatus claims 23-24; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

19   Claims 25, 32, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeulen in view of US 6,356,941 B1 to Cohen.

20.   In regard to claim 25, **Vermeulen** teaches the server-side data-processing

machine (*see "Remote Server,"* **in Fig. 1 [14]**) of claim 21, but

     Vermeulen does not teach wherein said data-access engine is configured to only

fulfill said data request according to restrictions set by a network vault as claimed.

     However, **Cohen** teaches a data-access engine (*see "Server's Software*

Module," **in Fig. 3 [48]**) is configured to only fulfill said data request (*e.g. "request by a*

transaction to access stored information," **in Col. 13, Lines 42-43**) according to

restrictions set by a network vault (*e.g. Security software module 48 examines each*

such request to determine…whether the user has permission to perform the transaction

to the particular network vault," **in Col. 13, Lines 43-47**).

     Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the claimed invention to combine the feature of restricting the retrieval of the

requested stored data by using "network vaults" as disclosed in **Cohen**, into the

teachings of **Vermeulen** since both reference are directed toward a accessing stored

data, hence would be considered to be analogous based on their related fields of

endeavor.

     One would have been motivated to do so as Cohen discloses the problems

associated with proxy servers and filtered communication and discussed the

advantages of using network vaults to increase security (*e.g. "firewalls and proxy*

servers, can only provide filtering of communication and therefore are not sufficiently

robust and secure to permit a direct connection to, and packet exchange with, limited

access network 18. Therefore, if a risk is overlooked, the filter will fail. Also, the security

of the firewall and/or proxy server itself can be breached, enabling the intruder to

change the declarations for filtering in order to permit unauthorized access through the

firewall and/or proxy server. However, the present invention does not require such

packet exchange across networks, so no such declarations are needed," **from Cohen**

in Col. 7, Lines 39-50).

21.   Claim 32 is a corresponding system claim of system claim 25; therefore, it is
under the same rationale.

22.   Claim 39 is a corresponding system claim of method claim 25; therefore, it is
under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

23.   Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new
ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

24.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to
applicant's disclosure.

US 5,935,207 to Louge et al.

US 2002/0162020 A1 to Bellaton et al.

US 6,144,996 to Starnes et al.

US 2003/0005080 A1 to Watkins et al.

US 2002/0184403 A1 to Dahlin et al.

US 5,642,515 to Jones et al.

US 2003/0050974 A1 to Mani-Meitav et al.

25.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

26.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JONATHAN WILLIS whose telephone number is (571)270-7467. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 A.M. - 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on (571)272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JONATHAN WILLIS/
Examiner, Art Unit 2441
10/20/2009

/Quang N. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2441